Norman Thomas's 75th Birthday Speech, Pps. 2-3

Extra: Adenauer Preparing German Opinion for Relinquishment of Eastern Territories, Page 4

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VI, NO. 45 NOVEMBER 30, 1959 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The UN Demonstrates Its Independence

United Nations, N. Y.

The nuclear votes in the United Nations last week-end again demonstrated that the General Assembly can no longer be controlled by the United States. Not only the Afro-Asian bloc but Latin America, Scandinavia and Canada showed a remarkable independence. This promises well for the future of the UN; its vitality and moral power will grow the more it shows that it is not an instrument of cold war policy, and the tool of neither side in the Russo-American tug of war.

The biggest defeat for Washington was the 51-to-16 vote in favor of the resolution calling on France to desist from testing an atom bomb in the Sahara. In committee, on November 12, U. S. influence had lined up enough votes to block the two-thirds required for passage. The vote then was 46-to-26. But when the resolution came before the General Assembly Nov. 20, Denmark, Mexico, Bolivia, Ecuador and Panama shifted to vote in favor of it and 7 Latin American countries which had voted "no" abstained. The result was to marshal better than two-thirds for the resolution.

Despite Lodge's Opposition

A double defeat was suffered by the U. S. the day before when four NATO members, Canada, Denmark, Iceland and Norway, joined 14 Latin American nations, Ireland, New Zealand and Sweden, to pile up 60 votes for a 24-nation resolution calling on the three nuclear powers and all other nations to desist from further nuclear testing. The vote came after Henry Cabot Lodge expressed his opposition to the resolution which was, of course, opposed by France. The U. S. and 19 other nations showed their disapproval by abstaining (see list in box on this page).

A less obvious but more important defeat came in a vote a few minutes earlier on a three power substitute resolution which Austria, Japan and Sweden had put forward. This omitted any reference to testing by powers not now members of the nuclear club but did call on the three nuclear powers "to continue their present voluntary discontinuance of the testing of nuclear weapons." No one voted against this, and only France and Afghanistan abstained. It passed 76-to-0. But though the U. S. voted for it, Mr. Lodge made clear that he did not agree with it. "We do not think," he told the Assembly, "that an indefinite continuation of a voluntary uncontrolled suspension of tests will contribute" to the U. S. objective of test cessation with controls. He declared that "we consider that test suspension which is not subject to verification is incompatible with requirements of national security," and he made clear that whether the U. S. continues its voluntary moratorium after the first of the year depends "on circumstances which have yet to develop." Obviously some of our closest allies do not think the possibility of some undetected testing underground in the range of very small weapons is serious enough to justify the end of the present voluntary stand-still on testing. In this respect the vote was a victory for the Soviet point of view.

On the other hand, when the Soviet Union opposed the Irish resolution against the dissemination of nuclear weapons as "delusive," it lost its allies. Just as the U. S. did not dare vote against the two resolutions which called for an end of testing, so the Soviet Union did not dare to do more than abstain on the Irish resolution. This was adopted 68-to-0. The Soviet bloc found itself in the odd company of Nationalist China, France, and Peru, the only other abstainers. The Irish resolution had obviously been watered down to muster so large a vote. The Soviet bloc complained that it did not deal with the problem of stationing nuclear weapons on the territory of other countries, and that it merely proposed that the 10-nation disarmament committee *study* the problem of how to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons. The Soviet bloc also seemed to fear suggestions in the resolution for a system of inspection to make sure that non-nuclear powers do not begin to produce nuclear weapons. Obviously most other nations either felt that the Irish resolution was at least a good first moral gesture against the spread of nuclear weapons or voted for it from fear of world public opinion.

The Line-Up in Three Significant Nuclear Votes

On the resolution in the UN General Assembly Nov. 20 asking France to refrain from testing an atom bomb in the Sahara, adopted 51 votes to 16 with 15 abstentions. Those who voted against were: Dominican Republic, France, Honduras, Israel, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Union of South Africa, Great Britain, the U. S. A., Belgium and Brazil. Those who abstained were: El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Laos, Paraguay, Thailand, Turkey, Uruguay, Argentina, Australia, Chile, China, Colombia, and Costa Rica.

On the 24-nation resolution Nov. 21 appealing not only to the three nuclear powers but to non-nuclear powers not to engage in testing, adopted 60 to 1, with 20 abstentions. The vote against: France. The abstainers: Dominican Republic, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Peru, Portugal, Spain, Thailand, Turkey, Union of South Africa, Great Britain, the U. S. A., Belgium, Brazil, China, Greece, Haiti, Honduras, Israel and Italy.

On the Irish resolution Nov. 20 against the spread of nuclear weapons, adopted 68-0 with 12 abstentions. The abstainers were: China, Czechoslovakia, France, Hungary, Peru, Poland, Romania, Ukraine SSR, USSR, Albania, Bulgaria, Byelorussian SSR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Given Peace, Norman Thomas Says US and USSR Economies Will Grow Alike...

By Norman Thomas

I doubt if Karl Marx, risen from the dead and listening to Mr. Khrushchov and his American hosts describing their respective systems would recognize them for what he called socialism and capitalism. Both can more accurately be defined as very different forms of state capitalism; the Russian under control of a totalitarian government, ours far less centralized with far more room for private profit. I am of the school of those who believe that if we can avoid catastrophe and if we should continue our present directions of economic evolution in both the USA and the USSR our two *economic* systems in the coming decade will be so nearly similar as to abolish acute ideological conflict. Neither will be truly socialist although both will have to be consciously concerned with popular welfare as original laissez faire capitalism was not.

The tremendously significant difference between our social order today and the Russian is political; our glory is our enjoyment of democracy and individual right. It is a glory we tarnish by our racism at home, by remnants of McCarthyism, and by our habit of calling nations under cruel dictators—Franco's Spain, for instance—"free" just as long as their dictators are not Communist.

A World of the Many Poor and the Few Rich

Even if there were no cold war C. P. Snow's prediction that the present disparity between rich men and nations and poor cannot survive is sound. For example, an economic system by any name will be intolerable under which in a world with exploding populations an essential natural resource like petroleum is so managed as to make the King of Saudi Arabia and Mr. Paul Getty the richest men in the world.

But not even the extraordinary boon of the release of men, money and natural resources consequent upon general disarmament down to a police level would automatically solve the problem of the adequate production and equitable distribution of goods and services necessary for the conquest of the poverty of 70 percent of our world's inhabitants who live habitually on the margin between hunger and starvation while in our country Tiffany's advertises solid gold putters. That cannot be the consequence of competitive struggle for private profit in a world of fantastically disparate nations all claiming absolute sovereignty over their people. Planning, and what's more international planning, is absolutely essential. The farther we move into a world where only complex scientific processes can supply us with energy and resources essential to a decent life, the more essential correlated planning will be. Its overriding principle must be socialist, that is the dominance of production for use in order that men may be served by things rather than mastered by them.

Planning Without Coercion

In general we believers in democracy are challenged to prove that this planning can successfully be carried on especially in non-industrialized countries without some approaches to the terrible coercion of communism in the Soviet Union and China. This planning will insist on industrialization and far greater efficiency in agriculture and heretofore this kind of planning has seemed to mean inescapable growth in bureaucracy. Our own nation is already highly industrialized through an historical process impossible of close imitation. But in it, despite our loud talk of free enterprise and the real vigor of our imperfect democracy we live and work under four bureaucracies: of civil government, of the military, of Big Business, and Big Unions. My Democratic and Republican friends will not escape the problems of the place and limitation of bureaucracies in an efficient democracy simply by denying an extension of public ownership.

What No Presidential Candidate Will Say

Next year will be a Presidential year, our quadrennial contest in evasion, exaggeration and stultification. It is a pity that there will be no candidate in the field to speak the language of peace and socialism as Norman Thomas did at his 75th birthday dinner in New York last week. The speech was broadcast over the radio network of NBC and said things no one has said to a nationwide audience since the Wallace campaign of 1948. We reprint an abridged version of the Thomas speech here, and we offer reprints in bulk lots to peace and church groups around the country.

Socialism No Panacea

I grant that this problem of democratic controls in our modern industrialized society is of major concern to us socialists who have arrived at no panacea for its solution. Our concern over bureaucracy is one reason for our lessened emphasis on social ownership of the means of production and distribution. Certainly such ownership is not a single track road to utopia. Democratic controls through taxation, collective bargaining and the growth of cooperatives are at least as important as an extension of social ownership. Nevertheless, it would be far easier to deal with the problem raised by the steel strike were this absolutely basic industry to be socially owned and operated like TVA with labor and consumer representation in the authority. It is certain that a democratic society cannot forever be as impotent ours has been in dealing with the steel oligopoly, its administered prices and their inflationary effect, its obduracy in collective bargaining, its power to paralyze our economy.

But as I look at the present and toward the future, more and more I find myself thinking that if men in this thermonuclear age can put war out of the world they will surely have the wisdom and strength to deal with their other problems. If they cannot put war out of the world, these problems will scarcely matter. Mankind will end its extraordinary story of shame and glory by suicide of its civilization if not of itself. Our only hope, the only hope of generations yet unborn, is a world without war. To accept that fact is the essential beginning of wisdom.

There are some encouraging developments. It is good that Secretary Herter said that today we face a challenge that no society has ever fully met, how to make competition the life, not the death, of nations. This indicates a possible better climate for negotiation, as does also the recent increase of public interest in disarmament. Against this however must be set the sorrowful fact that men of the stature of former President Truman and Governor Rockefeller should have asked the immediate resumption of thermonuclear tests which carried on even underground are, according to none other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

. . . Attacks Truman and Rockefeller on Testing, Thinks Mr. K. Wants Arms Cuts

than Dr. Libby a possible danger, depending on the characteristics of the rock. What is far worse is that our resumption of tests without any evidence of Russian resumption would deprive us of any moral leadership in the world.

Moreover, there is now what looks like an organized effort to minimize our peril in war. On the basis of various studies, official and unofficial, we are assured that one attack on the United States, admittedly comparatively "moderate," would destroy only some 20 percent of us and half of our homes. The rest of us might survive especially if we should make nice little concrete block shelters to keep in our cellars or drag around behind our cars. Then, as I heard Mr. Herman Kahn say on TV, "the human fertility rate is high."

The Vested Interests in the Arms Race

Among those preaching or easily accepting one or another of these false hopes are members of very powerful groups with an immense stake in continuance of the cold war and a speeding up of the arms race. To the military it means such power and prestige as they never before enjoyed except in actual war. To many scientists and to a great many colleges and universities it means better support for fascinating scientific research than they could have imagined. To innumerable corporations, great and small, it means contracts with guaranteed profits. To workers it means jobs.

The bitter irony is that the hideous social and economic waste of the arms race is a major source of what we Americans call prosperity. Obviously an intelligent plan for disarmament must take account of the economic factor. We must plan to use a large part of what we have on arms, on health, education, the cooperative war against the world's poverty and then make some intelligent reduction in taxes. Of course it could be done.

I do not charge that the passionate supporters of the cold war desire it to become World War III. They are probably sincere but deluded in believing in the possibility of indefinite if not perpetual peace by the deterrence of horror. But where your treasure is there will your heart be also—I am quoting Scripture and not *Das Kapital*—and their treasure is in continuing the cold war. We rationalize easily what is to our immediate interest.

A Common Eagerness to Live

To deny this is by no means to deny the magnitude of the threat that Stalinist communism has offered and still offers to the peace and freedom of mankind. We can deal with that threat constructively only by mutual agreement that a common eagerness to live compels us to accept controlled disarmament under a strengthened UN. I happen to believe that Khrushchov in his own interest and his country's may be more serious about disarmament than our Pentagon; the difficulty will arise from his attitude toward countries and the necessary strengthening of the UN.

In my recent book, *The Prerequisites of Peace,* I argued that by a combination and only by a combination of controlled universal disarmament down to a police level, a strengthened UN, disengagement and a cooperative attack on the poverty of many nations can we hope for a secure peace. A reviewer commented that my "prescription" is "too far-reaching and too contrary to big power politics to win substantial support, but it is a thesis unassailable in terms of common sense." I don't believe that big power politics anywhere could so easily prevail over common sense when the stake is the future of our human race except for the fact that war is so much a part of our common heritage, older than any institution except some form of the family. . . . There was a time when war had its code of honor, even its own ethics. Total destruction was not its objective—not even for the Tartar hordes. There were things honorable soldiers would not do. But no more.

Those Dirty Materialists Reject Two-Cars-in-Every-Garage

"Theirs [i.e. the Soviet] is a materialistic society. They assign a low priority to those endeavors which would lead to a fuller life for their people. The attitude they take toward automobiles is a good illustration of this policy. Mr. Khrushchov was undoubtedly impressed by the view he gained of our overall economic strength. He was by no means persuaded that he should emulate us in the automotive field."

—CIA Chief Allen W. Dulles to the Joint Economic Committee on Soviet economic progress, Nov. 13.

Democracy, The FBI and the ICBM

We come home from our churches and synagogues after listening to the words of Isaiah or Micah or Jesus and in our comfortable homes discuss the necessity we are under to provide our sons if not ourselves with weapons wherewith they may destroy literally millions of their fellow human beings whom they have never seen, and leave chance survivors in such misery that they will pray for death as their sole deliverance. And then we wonder that our slums spawn gangs with an insensate love of lesser violence, a violence not consecrated by the God-State but only by the gang. We self-professed champions of democracy regard her as a delicate maiden only safe in a wicked world between an FBI man on one side and an intercontinental ballistic missile on the other.

There is beauty and joy in love of one's country. . . . But the nationalism which bids us forget that above all nations is humanity, the nationalism which in the absolute nation-state has usurped the place of God, is the most hideous idolatry the world has known. Today it is the nation-state even under some democratic controls which tells us: "Thou shalt have no other Gods before me . . . whatsoever I command becomes your duty . . . Thou shalt not kill except at my command and then the absolute destruction of my rivals shall become your holy mission."

If from some distant star I looked at this human scene, I should judge its madness incurable and its consequences inevitable destruction. But I am no onlooker from a distant star but a man among men, a man privileged to drink deep of the living waters of human friendship. I know something of the follies and perils that our ancestors survived and of the courage and wisdom without which men would have had no history. We, the living, are not yet destroyed, and surely we have found that the struggle for a sane society is of itself an antidote to despair. A very brave man, facing death, once wrote: "How hard death must be for those who meet it having done nothing." We can do something and do it for the life of our country and mankind.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Little Noticed Speech Could Clear Way for Franco-German Deal With Russia

Adenauer Preparing Germany for Relinquishment of Eastern Lands

Surprises are possible on the way to the summit. Not enough attention has been paid de Gaulle's acceptance of the Oder-Neisse line as the boundary between Germany and Poland. In the recent one-day debate on foreign policy in Bonn, the Social Democrats wanted to know whether de Gaulle's declaration was made after consultation with Adenauer. They got no answer; the debate merely demonstrated how feeble parliamentary government is in Germany and how paternalistically authoritarian is the Adenauer regime. Since de Gaulle coordinates basic economic and political policy with the Chancellor, it is unbelievable that de Gaulle would make so fundamental a declaration without Adenauer's approval.

Social Democratic Surmise Confirmed

The Social Democratic surmise is now confirmed by a speech which got little attention in the U. S. press. Franz Thedieck, Adenauer's State Secretary of the Ministry for All-German Affairs, told the Upper Silesian Association in a speech at Bonn Nov. 21 to spare itself illusions and realize that the Germans driven out of Upper Silesia had been replaced by millions of Poles. He said this shift in the population of the Oder-Neisse territory would have to be taken account of in any peace treaty.

This was the first open signal to German refugee associations that they must prepare to accept the present Polish-German boundary. Thedieck said the peace treaty would have to reflect "the guilt of those Germans who sought to introduce a 'new order' in Eastern Europe by suppressing and exterminating other nations." This was a fresh and wholesome note, as was his advice to the refugees to give up the old "drang nach Osten" idea.

Were Germany to reconcile itself to its present borders and give up the old dream of establishing its hegemony over Eastern Europe, Adenauer and de Gaulle would be in a position to deal independently with Russia. De Gaulle's dream is a new "Carolingian empire" based on a Franco-German union as the core of a continental Third Force under French leadership. The second fiddle role France has played in NATO has always irked de Gaulle. He dislikes "Anglo-Saxon" domination. He has already rid France of NATO atomic bases. He is a bold and ingenious man, and his declaration on Oder-Neisse may prefigure some new plan of his own for German reunification.

Khrushchov's curious calm about the delayed summit timetable may mean he feels he can do some interesting business on his visit to France before the summit. In the past, before World War I and World War II, France allied itself with Russia as a form of insurance against Germany. Now a friendly agreement with Russia would give the new Franco-German entente independence of NATO, and Franco-German industry an inside track to the Russian and Chinese markets. All this is only speculation, but it is well to keep in mind that fresh combinations are possible on the deadlocked European chess-board.

The time may well be near when Adenauer, fearing an East-West deal on Germany over his head, may prefer to negotiate directly on his own with de Gaulle at his side. The acceptance of the present Eastern borders, and the preparation of the German public for the relinquishment of Silesia and East Prussia, are necessary preludes to any such move. The Thedieck speech merits close attention.

Another Way to Make Us Safer Yet

"Another project is the Air Force Minuteman—a solid propellant intercontinental missile. Our studies show that it will be entirely feasible to deploy Minuteman missiles on railroad cars—which could move at random over the nation's vast rail network. Obviously a mobile missile force such as this will compound an enemy's targeting problems—thus further increasing the ability of our missile force to survive an enemy's surprise attack. . . . A Minuteman force composed of both hardened and mobile sites will greatly increase the security of our deterrent posture."

—Gen. Thomas D. White, Chief of Staff, USAF, at the NATO Parliamentarian Conference, Nov. 16.

This reassuring new national safety measure should also make railroad travel less humdrum. The traveller who buys a ticket for some place no more exotic than New Brunswick may find himself landing—with other Minuteman fragments—in Irkutsk.

Please Help Us By Putting Gift Subs to the Weekly on Your Xmas Shopping List

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

11/30/59

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

I. F. Stone's Weekly. Entered as Second Class Matter at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Post-dated Mondays but published every Thursday except the last two Thursdays of August and December at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington 15, D. C. An independent weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U. S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED